Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/017,153 First Named Applicant: Bill Mitchell
Examiner: Josiah C. Cocks Art Unit: 3749 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:
(1) Andrew J. Heinisch (2) Josiah C. Cocks, Examiner

(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: Any Proposed Time: Any

Type of Interview Requested:
(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO
If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims/ Fig.#s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Please see attached sheet		_____	☐	☐	☐
(2) _____	_____	_____	☐	☐	☐
(3) _____	_____	_____	☐	☐	☐
(4) _____	_____	_____	☐	☐	☐

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:
Please see attached sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:
This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).
This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

_____ _____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature) (Examiner/SPE Signature)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
If you need assistance in completing this form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Interview Request Form (7/1/2003)

ATTACHMENT TO APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Application No.: 10/017,153 First Named Applicant: Bill Mitchell
Examiner: Josiah C. Cocks Art Unit: 3749 Status of Application: Pending

Applicant respectfully requests an interview in the above-identified patent application to see whether an appeal in this case can be averted. Applicant has concurrently (but separately) filed herewith a Notice of Appeal. Applicant would like to discuss the motivation, teaching or suggestion for combining the references. Applicant also wishes to discuss the apparent problem that several claim limitations are still missing even with the asserted combination. Applicant wishes to go through each claim and dependent claims and have the Examiner identify specific limitations in the references to clarify matters for appeal. See MPEP§2143 (the references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations). For example:

1. Where is the disclosure in Nakamura et al. or Harwath et al. as claimed in claim 5 that the solenoid valve while in the first state bypasses oil through the return to the fuel supply?

2. Where is the disclosure in the references of a downstream passage including a first branch to the regulating valve assembly and a second branch to the diaphragm valve?

3. Where is the specific operation and sequencing of claim 8 as claimed disclosed in either of the references? Nakamura et al. does not appear to show stopping the flow at burner start-up, but instead the solenoid valve mechanism is provided for only stopping the supply when the electric current to the oil burner is stopped (this is the opposite of the claimed invention in which start-up of the burner would require electrical current and despite the fact that there is electric current, there is no oil flow to the burner by virtue of the solenoid valve according to the claimed invention).

4. Where in the references is there a thermistor as claimed in claim 9?

5. Where is there a means for switching the solenoid between states after a predetermined time as claimed in claim 15?

6. Where does a solenoid valve control fuel flow through a bypass point in the oil regulation as claimed in claim 17?

7. Where are the limitations of claims 18-20 disclosed or taught?

8. Where in the asserted combination is the limitation of claim 11 provided that the electronic control and the oil regular prevent pressurized fuel flow to the nozzle upon start-up of the burner and allow pressurized fuel flow to the nozzle after start-up of the burner? The Examiner cited Nakamura et al. reference which discloses a solenoid valve mechanism which allows the supply of a fuel oil to the oil supply pipe to be stopped which the supply of electric current to the oil burner is stopped. See Col. 4, lns. 46-54.

9. Where do the references teach a first state of a solenoid valve which keeps the regulating valve (a second valve) closed as claimed in claim 1?